



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. IX.—*On Manetho's Chronology of the New Kingdom.*
By the Rev. EDWARD HINCKS, D.D.

[*Read 15th December, 1860.*]

So many attempts have been made to restore the original chronology of Manetho from the list of kings which have been transmitted to us, on his authority, by Africanus, Eusebius, and others, that it will naturally be considered presumptuous in any one to make a new attempt. And yet, even as respects the new kingdom, the attempts that have been hitherto made, are very unsatisfactory ; and we find them to be at variance both with the chronology of the Assyrian Inscriptions, of Ptolemy's Canon, and of the 2nd Book of Kings,—all of which are in perfect harmony with one another. Even so late as the 25th, or Ethiopian dynasty, we find Lepsius and Bunsen opposed to one another. The cause of all these failures,—for such I consider all the attempts at restoring the true chronology which have hitherto been made to be,—I believe to be an unsound method of criticising the lists that have come down to us ; and I ascribe the success, which I flatter myself I have attained, to my proceeding in a way which, so far as I am aware, is wholly new.

I will begin by explaining the difference between my method and the former ones. My predecessors employed but a single criticism, while I have employed a double criticism,—one conducted on the same principles as that of my predecessors, but the other, which is preliminary to this, being conducted on a totally different principle. They have assumed that the persons who have extracted from Manetho the lists of kings in the different dynasties, misapprehended Manetho's meaning ; they have endeavoured to correct his errors, and to restore the true chronology by comparing the lists with the facts respecting the different dynasties which are established by monumental evidence. I agree with them as to this being the proper course if we had the lists of kings in the different dynasties as they were drawn up by the original Extractor ; but what I hope to be able to establish is, that the lists which have come down to us are very different from what the original

Extractor drew up, and that a criticism which is independent of monumental evidence, and founded on the different chronological systems that were maintained by the early Christians and the Jews, must be employed in the first instance, in order to obtain the genuine lists of the Extractor from Manetho. I accordingly propose to myself two objects:—first, to restore the genuine lists of the Extractor from Manetho, in doing which I disregard monumental evidence, having regard solely to evidence furnished by the lists themselves, and to the chronological schemes of those by whom the lists were transmitted to us; and secondly, having recovered the genuine lists of the Extractor, to correct his mistakes, as well as those of Manetho himself, from the monumental evidence.

In the present paper I will confine myself, for the most part, to dynasties, making no attempt at determining the dates of the accessions of particular kings prior to the 23rd dynasty. The dates which I will give, whether as those of the lists as they existed at different periods, or as restored by myself in my first criticism, are always intended to represent the Egyptian year, which was counted as the first of a reign or of a dynasty. These Egyptian years I count from Nabonassar (A.N.), or *before* Nabonassar (B.N.); and to each of these years I add the date of its first day in the proleptic Julian (or rather Augustan) year, as commonly used by chronologers. I begin with giving the list attributed to Africanus by the Syncellus, with some marginal notes of a chronological character:—

			B.C.
18th dynasty lasted 263 years	B.N. 920	(16 Oct. 1667).
19th "	209 " Troy taken at its close	657	(9 Aug. 1404).
20th "	135 " 	448	(20 Junc. 1195).
21st "	130 " 	313	(15 May. 1060).
22nd "	120 " 	183	(13 April. 930).
23rd "	89 " Olympiads begin with it	63	(14 March. 810).
24th "	6 " 990 years	A.N. 27	(20 Feb. 721).
25th "	40 " 	33	(18 Feb. 715).
26th "	150 " 	73	(8 Feb. 675).
27th 		223	(2 Jan. 525).

Total .. 1142 years.

Diodorus says that Amasis died, and Cambyses conquered Egypt in the 3rd year of the 63rd Olympiad, which began in the summer of 526 B.C. It is therefore possible that all the above dates should be thrown back a year.

Now, though the Syncellus attributes the above list to Africanus, it is certain that, as it stands, it is not his; because in page 148 D., the Syncellus quotes from Africanus a statement that Moses, *i.e.*, the Exodus, was 1235 years before Cyrus; and, as he allowed 31 years to Cyrus,

the Exodus was consequently 1266 years before the accession of Cambyses, and about 1272 before the conquest of Egypt. We know also that Africanus placed the Exodus 110 years earlier than the Syncellus himself did, and the latter placed it 20 years earlier than the early Christians did ; so that Africanus threw it back 130 years, rejecting the generation of the second, or post-diluvian, Cainan, while he made the whole interval between the Creation and the birth of Christ 5500 years, as all the early Christians before Eusebius did. The 130 years taken away before the Exodus were added by Africanus, partly to the interval between Joshua and Samuel, and partly to that between the capture of Jerusalem and the death of Cyrus, so that Africanus would have added the whole of the 130 years in question to the interval between the Exodus, or (according to him, and all the early Christians before Eusebius, as well as according to Josephus) the accession of the 18th dynasty and the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses. It is evident from this that the list given above is not that of Africanus, but of some anonymous corrector of his who, knowing that Africanus had placed the Exodus 130 years too early, determined to correct his mistake. It appears that he did so in the simplest manner possible, by striking off 130 years from the duration of the 18th dynasty ; for Josephus expressly states, more than once, that the kings of the 18th dynasty reigned 393 years,—exactly 130 over the number assigned to them in the above list. I accordingly restore the list of Africanus by substituting, for the 1st line in the above list,—

18th dynasty, 393 years . . . n.n. 1050 (15 Nov. 1797 b.c.)

But that this list was falsified by Africanus, through the addition of the 130 years which he added to the interval between the Exodus and the conquest of Cambyses, there can be no question ; for St. Clement of Alexandria states that the Exodus took place 345 years before the canicular cycle commenced, that is, before 1322 b.c., and consequently in 1667 b.c. Yet the length of the 18th dynasty is fixed by the testimony of Josephus. It seems, therefore, that Africanus added 130 years to the interval between the accession of the 19th dynasty and the conquest of Cambyses ; and we have to enquire to which dynasty or dynasties he added it.

It seems evident, in the first place, that he added nothing to the 22nd dynasty, or to any of those that followed it. The 22nd dynasty must have commenced before the death of Solomon, and it is quite inconsistent with Biblical chronology to suppose that this happened so late as 930 b.c., the date given above. The lengths of the dynasties after the 21st are too short as they stand, and we cannot reasonably suppose that Africanus found them still shorter than they are.

Neither is it likely that he added anything to the 21st dynasty, of which all the kings are enumerated, with reigns of very moderate extent. On the other hand, there are suspicious circumstances about both the 19th and 20th dynasties. In the 20th no king's name is mentioned. The reigns, instead of being given separately, are lumped together, and it would be very easy to alter the gross sum. In the 19th dynasty we have four consecutive reigns made to last 192 years, or perhaps 197 years, if a reading, which appears in itself probable, be adopted. This would be a circumstance unparalleled in authentic history; and although part of the 130 years may have been added to the 20th dynasty, I cannot doubt that the larger part of it was made to swell out these reigns. I restore, therefore, the list as it existed before the corrections of Africanus, in the following manner:—

	B.C.
18th dynasty, 393 years . . .	B.N. 920 (16 Oct. 1667).
19th & 20th dynasty, 214 „ . . .	B.N. 527 (8 July, 1274).

The remainder as in the list given by the Syncellus.

But is it right to make the accession of the 18th dynasty synchronise with the Exodus? All the Christian fathers, as well as Josephus, thought so, but no one at the present day entertains such an opinion. We know that the date 1667 b.c., was obtained by combining a Biblical number with a Christian tradition. The tradition made the birth of Christ to be 5500 years from the Creation; and according to the Septuagint version, allowing 215 years from the descent of Jacob into Egypt to the Exodus, from the Creation to the Exodus was 3837 or 3839 years. The latter number was that of Demetrius, and is the more correct, but the former was that usually adopted. Christ was born, it was reckoned, four years before the vulgar Christian era, which gives for the Exodus 1667 before that era. It seems to me evident that the synchronism between the Exodus and the commencement of the 18th dynasty was obtained by corrupting the lists which passed under the name of Manetho; and I think I have discovered the precise corrections which were introduced with this object. After the 24th dynasty, we have the words "990 years" remaining in the text of Manetho. They have now no meaning, but if understood as a summation of all the dynasties of the New Kingdom, to the end of the 24th dynasty, we find that this summation would be correct if we only substitute the length of the 24th dynasty as given by Eusebius for that given by Africanus. On the strength of this remarkable coincidence, I do not hesitate to add 38 years to the 24th dynasty. I observe also, that in the 26th dynasty, the commencement of every reign in which is as well ascertained as that of the conquest of Egypt, Africanus has

taken away 10 years. According to him, the first year of Psammitichus was A.N. 94 (3 Feb. 654) whereas it was really A.N. 84 (5 Feb. 664). According to Africanus, and doubtless according to those whom he followed, the commencement of the dynasty was 20 years before this. We must therefore add 48 years to all the dates in the above list, as last corrected, which precede the 25th dynasty, and ten years to the dates of the 26th and 27th; and we shall obtain the list as it stood before it was tampered with by any Christian chronologist:—

			B.C.
18th dynasty lasted 393 years	B.N. 968 (28 Oct. 1715).
19th & 20th	214	..	575 (20 July, 1822).
21st dynasty lasted 130	"	..	361 (27 May, 1108).
22nd	120	..	231 (25 April, 978).
23rd	89	..	111 (26 March, 858).
24th	44	..	22 (3 March, 769).
		<hr/> 990	
25th	40	..	A.N. 23 (21 Feb. 725).
26th to Psammitichus	21	..	63 (11 Feb. 685).
1st Psammitichus	84 (5 Feb. 664).

I cannot doubt that the summation 990 is a genuine one; and that it must be preserved inviolate in any subsequent corrections.

I suspect that a correction ought to be made in the length of the 21st and 22nd dynasties. The numbers 130 and 120 are neither of them the sums of the separate reigns, which are 114 and 116. I think it probable that some Jewish chronologist, perhaps Josephus, substituted $130 + 120$, for $114 + 136$, in order to make the accession of the 22nd dynasty fall a little before the death of Solomon, which he probably supposed to have taken place about 995 B.C. This correction is not, however, so certain as those previously noticed. The commencement of the 20th dynasty must be placed immediately after the date of the capture of Troy, according to the Greek chronology used by Manetho, or his Extractor; and the error as to the 23rd dynasty, in the first reign of which the first Olympiad ought to fall, but does not,—is due to the Extractor himself who endeavoured to rectify miscalculations which he falsely supposed to have existed in Manetho's work.

Before proceeding further, I ought to consider the Egyptian chronology of Eusebius. He appears to have had before him both the text of the Extractor, in the form last given before it was altered by the Christian chronologists, and a certain "Old Chronicle," which was also derived from Manetho, being copied by some person, probably a Jew or Christian, who lopped off the early dynasties. I will give the chronology according to these two schemes, which may be compared with that of the Extractor, in the form last given:—

Old Chronicle.	B.C.	Eusebius.	B.C.
18th dyn. 348 ..	1002 (3 Nov. 1749).	348 ..	987 (31 Oct. 1734).
19th " 194 ..	654 (8 Aug. 1401).	194 ..	639 (5 Aug. 1386).
20th " 228 ..	460 (21 June, 1207).	178 ..	445 (16 June, 1192).
21st " 121 ..	232 (25 April, 979).	130 ..	267 (4 May, 1014).
22nd " 48 ..	111 (26 Mar. 858).	49 ..	137 (1 April, 884).
23rd " 19 ..	63 (14 Mar. 830).	44 ..	88 (20 March, 835).
24th " 44 ..	44 (9 Mar. 791).	44 ..	44 (9 March, 791).
25th " 44 .. A.N. 1	(26 Feb. 747).	44 ..	A.N. 1 (26 Feb. 747).
26th to Psam. ..	45 (15 Feb. 703).	39 ..	45 (15 Feb. 703).

The last date in the above lists is obtained, by taking 39 years before the known date of the accession of Psammitichus. Eusebius, with a view to make the capture of Troy (which he fixed in 1182 b.c.) synchronise with the accession of the 20th dynasty, brought down all the above dates 10 years, diminishing by this period the interval between Psammitichus and Cambyses.

Now, on examining the above lists with reference to the sum of the 18th—24th dynasties, and with reference to the capture of Troy, or the accession of the 20th dynasty, I find the following very remarkable fact. The sum of the seven dynasties is 1002 in the Old Chronicle, twelve years too great; and in Eusebius it is 987, three years too small—the difference, fifteen years, is *precisely* the difference between the Old Chronicle date and the Eusebian date of the capture of Troy; and what is a still more remarkable coincidence, if we take 12, the excess of the Old Chronicle sum of the seven dynasties over the true sum 990, from the Old Chronicle date of the accession of the 28th dynasty, we have 1195, precisely the same as in the chronology of Africanus. It appears, then, that Africanus divided the 130 years, which he added to the 19th and 20th dynasties, in such a manner as that the old date of the accession of the 20th dynasty should be preserved; that is to say, he added to the 20th dynasty the 48 years which the early Christians had struck off from the 24th and 26th dynasties, and the 82 remaining years to the 19th. Eusebius took off three years probably—indeed, almost certainly—from the 23rd, which, with the ten which he struck off the 26th dynasty, brought the date of the accession of the 20th dynasty from 1195, Manetho's date, to 1182, Eusebius's own. The Old Chronicle added 12 years, and, I will at present suppose, to the same 23rd dynasty—thus making it 19, in place of 7.

I will now give the lengths of the dynasties with the years before Nabonassar, and b.c. when they began, according to the Extractor

from Manetho, before the Christians had tampered with his lists, and from the Old Chronicle, an apparently independent source of information as to Manetho's statements, marking the variations from it in Eusebius's list. These are obtained from the lists handed down to us by a criticism independent of the monuments, and from these I will endeavour to restore the original chronology of Manetho by help of the monuments :—

Extractor from Manetho.		Old Chronicle.		Eusebius.
	B.N.		B.N.	
18th dynasty	393 .. 968 (1715)	348 ..	990 (1737)	348 .. 990 (1737)
19th	127 .. 575 (1322)	104 ..	642 (1389)	194 .. 642 (1389)
20th	87 .. 448 (1195)	228 ..	448 (1195)	178 .. 448 (1195)
21st	130 .. 861 (1108)	121 ..	220 (967)	130 .. 270 (1017)
22nd	120 .. 231 (978)	48 ..	99 (846)	49 .. 140 (887)
23rd	89 .. 111 (858)	7 ..	51 (798)	47 .. 91 (888)
24th	44 .. 22 (769)	44 ..	44 (791)	44 .. 44 (791)
	A.N.		A.N.	
25th	40 .. 23 (725)	44 ..	1 (747)	44 .. 1 (747)
26th to Psam.	21 .. 63 (685)	39 ..	45 (703)	89 .. 45 (703)
Psam. 84 (664)	84 (664) 84 (664)

In all these lists we have the sum of the first seven periods equal to 990, and the sum of the last seven equal to 531. These fixed sums appear to me to be authentic records of Manetho himself. The two last periods in the Extractor's lists amount to 61, while in the other two lists they make up 83. As they are preceded by an item on which all are agreed, it is pretty evident that there is an error here, which must be rectified independently of anything that precedes the 26th dynasty. It is evident, however, from the Jewish chronology, and from the Assyrian, as compared with Ptolemy's canon, that 725 is the true date of the Ethiopian Conquest. Josiah was killed in b.c. 608, A.N. 140; for Nekao only came to the throne in the middle of his father's 55th year, A.N. 138, and was occupied with his canal for a considerable time before he commenced warlike operations. If we make A.N. 140 the first of Josiah's successor, A.N. 109 will be his own first year; A.N. 107, that of Amon; A.N. 52, that of Manasseh; and A.N. 23, that of Hezekiah. Samaria was taken in his 6th year, i.e., in A.N. 28, b.c. 720; and Hoshea had sent messengers to So, that is, Sabaco, the first Ethiopian king, three or four years before this. He must, consequently, have conquered Egypt before 724 b.c. On the other hand, in 700, the date of Sennacherib's invasion, which is fixed to A.N. 47, the third year of Belibus by the annals of Sennacherib and Ptolemy's canon, we have a king of Ethiopia, who was not king of Egypt, and who is identified with Tirhaka in the 2nd Book

of Kings. The two Ethiopian kings who preceded Tirhaka reigned 22 years, as appears from Africanus's list, which, in this dynasty, is unimpeached. Tirhaka would therefore have come to the throne of Ethiopia in 702, his first year from his father's death, being A.N. 45; but for some reason he did not assume the crown of Egypt for twelve years, his first year as a Pharaoh, being A.N. 57. For we are informed by one of Mariette's *Apis Stèles*, that an Apis, born in the 26th year of Tirhaka, died in the 20th year of Psammitichus, A.N. 103, aged 21 years. The 26th of Tirhaka must therefore have been A.N. 82.

The numbers which we read in the Old Chronicle, and in Eusebius, are too great. We must strike off 22 years, 18 of which are due to the circumstance that so many years are counted twice over, and the remaining four arise from an error in making the 25th dynasty to have lasted 44 years instead of 40. I believe, then, that the 25th and the early part of the 26th dynasty will be correctly arranged thus:—

Sabaco	8 years ..	His first A.N. 23	(21 Feb. 725).
Sabatico	14 ,," ..	" ..	31	(19 Feb. 717).
Tirhaka	12 ,," ..	As king of Ethiopia .	45	(15 Feb. 703).
"	27 ,," ..	As king of Egypt ..	57	(12 Feb. 691).
Stephinates	7 ,," ..	(According to the chronologers, but he never actually reigned)	.. A.N. 63	(11 Feb. 685).
Nechepsos	6 ,," ..	(Titular) ..	70	(9 Feb. 678).
Nekao I.	8 ,," ..	(Titular) ..	76	(7 Feb. 672).
Psam. I.	54 ,,"	84	(5 Feb. 664).

The reign of Bocchoris certainly preceded that of Sabaco, and must have commenced 44 years before it; his first year B.N. 22 (3 March, 769).

It appears from what has been said, that the Old Chronicle reckoned the reign of Tirhaka as 39 years—18 before the pretended accession of Stephinates, and 21 cotemporary with him and his two successors. To rectify this, we must reduce the reign of the 25th dynasty to 22, making it to include only the two first Ethiopian reigns. But as we must preserve the two summations of 990 and 531 years, this requires an addition of 22 years somewhere between the 19th and 25th dynasties, and a subtraction of 22 in the 18th or 19th.

If we add 22 years to the 22nd dynasty, as given by the Old Chronicle, we have 70; and if we take from the 20th dynasty the 50 years in which it is in excess above the number given by Eusebius, and add them to the 22nd, we shall have 120 years for the 22nd dynasty—the same number as given by the Extractor. The Old Chronicle's numbers for the 21st and 22nd dynasties appear to me to

have been altered by Eusebius ; 49 in particular was substituted for his 48, because there the reigns given by the Extractor amounted to 49 ; and he struck off from the 21st dynasty the year which he added to the 22nd.

I will now consider the arrangement of the dynasties from 1195 to the end of the 23rd dynasty. According to our authorities, as corrected above, the numbers stand thus :—

Extractor from Manetho.	B.N.	Old Chronicle.	B.N.	Eusebius.
20th dynasty	87 .. 448 (1195)	178 ..	448 (1195)	178 .. 448 (1195)
21st "	130 .. 361 (1108)	121 ..	270 (1017)	131 .. 270 (1017)
22nd "	120 .. 231 (978)	120 ..	149 (896)	70 .. 139 (886)
23rd "	89 .. 111 (858)	7 ..	29 (776)	47 .. 69 (816)
24th "	44 .. 22 (769)	44 ..	22 (769)	44 .. 22 (769)

It will be most convenient to begin my criticism on these lists with the 23rd dynasty. The numbers assigned to this dynasty as that of the Old Chronicle may not be quite correct ; for the 12 years in which that Chronicle was proved to be in excess of the truth, all of which I took from the 23rd dynasty, ought perhaps to have been in part taken from another. Still it cannot be doubted that the compiler of the Old Chronicle took a different view of the length of this dynasty as given by Manetho, from what the Extractor did whom Africanus followed, though with manifold corrections. The difference seems to me to be this. The Extractor gave the whole length of the dynasty ; but the Old Chronicle gave the interval between its commencement, and that of the commencement of the 24th, which reduced the kings of the 23rd to comparative obscurity. They were probably only acknowledged in a small part of the Delta, while Bocchoris and his conquerors the Ethiopians held the rest of Egypt. The commencement of the 23rd dynasty may, I think, be determined with a higher degree of probability from what has been said of Tirhaka. His first year from his father's death was A.N. 45 ; but in A.N. 57 he first assumed the double crown, calling himself king of Egypt instead of king of Ethiopia. Something must have occurred to induce him to do this ; and what is more likely than that it was the death of Zet, Seti III., the last king of the 23rd dynasty. This would make the first year of Petubastes, the chief of the dynasty, B.N. 23 (6 March, 780 B.C.) This is in perfect harmony with the statement, preserved in Africanus's list, that in his time the Olympiads began. Thus, the 23rd dynasty really reigned over Egypt in the beginning of the reign of Petubastes ; and again, for the last twelve years of the

reign of Seti ; when Tirhaka, who perhaps married his daughter, or who was perhaps the son of his sister, allowed the government to be carried on in his name. I believe that this Seti is the king who appears in Lepsius's *Königsbuch*, No. 618, under the name of Pankhi. The first part of the name is defaced, that of the god, as I suppose, which was defaced out of hostility to him.

If this view be correct, it is probable that the titular reigns of Stephanites and his successors commenced six years earlier than I have above supposed ; so that Nekao I. was killed by the Ethiopians, as is recorded by him, in B.C. 671, his eighth year. The interval between this and the accession of Psammitik I. in B.C. 664 is little enough for the flight of this prince to Syria, and for those events, which are represented by the Greek historians as the retirement of the Ethiopian monarch and the dodecarchy. I observe that there is no proof that Tirhaka entered on his 27th year. He may have retired at the end of the 26th, when his family had ruled in Egypt for 60 years, the following year being one of anarchy. The error in the lists which this implies is, however, to be attributed to Manetho himself.

The interval between the accessions of Petubastes and Bocchoris being 11 years, it follows, that in place of taking 12 years from the 23rd dynasty of the Old Chronicle, I should have taken 8 from it, and 4 from some other, probably the 22nd. This would leave 116 years for the 22nd, which is just the sum of the reigns in the list which the Syncellus gives as that of Africanus. It is certain, however, that this number is far too small. The discoveries of Mariette prove that the interval must have exceeded 160 years, and it may have exceeded it by 50 or 60 years, for anything that appears to the contrary. Again, the soundest modern criticism has fixed the death of Solomon to B.C. 990, 210 years before the accession of Petubastes ; and we knew that Sheshak was king of Egypt for some years before the death of Solomon. The most probable restoration of the true length of the dynasty is 216 ; adding 100 years, which the compiler of the Old Chronicle took from it and added to the 20th.

To bring this out from the Extractor's list, we must first correct the numbers in the 21st and 22nd dynasties, by adding the several reigns. These, in the 21st, make 114, which I consider to be the true length of the dynasty. The 16 years which are in excess here being added to the 22nd, we have for it 136, and in order to obtain 216 we must add 80 years to this dynasty.

It is necessary, however, that no change should be made in the date of the accession of the 20th dynasty, nor in the sum, 990. The former condition will be satisfied if we suppose that the later dynasties

overlapped one another for 80 years ; but in order to satisfy the latter, we must deduct 80 years from the duration of the 18th dynasty, making it 313 years, commencing B.N. 888 (8 Oct., 1635).

To show how the Extractor from Manetho was led into mistake, I will give the dynasties in question as I suppose that Manetho gave them, with the first and the last year of each, as well as the length.

20th dynasty lasted	87 years	B.N.	448	—	362
21st	"	114	"	361	— 248
22nd	"	216	"	247	— 32
23rd	"	89	"	33	A.N. 56
24th	"	44	"	22	" 22
25th	"	40	"	A.N. 23	" 62
26th	"	160	"	63	" 222

The Extractor had the lengths of the dynasties, but he did not understand that the reign of Petubastes began two years before that of the last king of the 22nd dynasty ended ; and that, in like manner, the 23rd dynasty overlapped the two following ones by 78 years. He knew, however, that the sum of the above seven dynasties *ought to be* 670 years, in order to bring out the known date of the accession of the 20th ; and finding that the gross sum *was* 750, he struck off the excess from the 22nd dynasty, which he thought could best spare it. As to the places where these hundred years should be inserted in the 22nd dynasty, I can offer nothing positive. It appears to me most probable that the three single reigns which Africanus gave were given correctly ; and that each of the two sums of these reigns which he gives, was diminished, one of them probably by 40, the other by 60 years ; but without further monumental evidence than I have at present before me, I can say nothing further.

As to the 21st dynasty, I cannot help thinking that Lepsius and Bunsen are completely mistaken in supposing it to have consisted of the Theban high priests and their successors. I adopt De Roug 's view, that it was a distinct dynasty enthroned in the Delta, and the last king of it I believe to have been the father-in-law of Osorkon I, No. 565 of the K nigsbuch, whose name, Psiukhennu, appears to me to be clearly the Psusernes of the lists ; for Manetho always used a Σ to express the Egyptian *kh*, which in his time and in his district must have been pronounced *sh*.

It may be thought that 87 years is far too small a space of time to allow for the many princes of the name of Rameses who must be referred to the 20th dynasty. But I reply that it is only meant that they reigned 87 years over the whole of Egypt. The dynasty may have continued as contemporary with the 21st ; and their successors,

the Theban high priests, would be cotemporary with the latter part of the 21st, so that Sheshak would have immediately succeeded these high priests, whose priestly office, as well as whose royalty, he appears to have taken on himself.

I proceed now to speak of the 18th and 19th dynasties; and that the greater part of the 19th was cotemporary with the 18th, or rather consisted of the same kings as are included in the 18th, I hold to be quite certain. The 18th dynasty began with the expulsion of the shepherds by Amasis; and according to the view taken of it by Josephus and others, it lasted so as to include Merinphthah, who was evidently the king in whose reign the shepherds overran the country for the second time. I cannot doubt that it ended with the flight of Merinphthah to Ethiopia.

On the other hand, Rameses I. appears to have been the head of the 19th dynasty, he being descended, in the female line, from the 18th; while the kings of the 18th dynasty, his predecessors, were all descended in the male line, from Amasis. It is remarkable that the 19th dynasty commences with the first year of the canicular cycle (B.N. 575, 20 July, 1322 b.c.) I have long since identified Rameses I., Men-peh-re, with the Menophres after whom, according to Theon, the years of the cycle are called. This name is much more like Men-peh-re than Meri-n-phthah, which so many Egyptologists have supposed it to be. The 18th dynasty, according to the Extractor, was terminated by the second invasion of the shepherds, and the flight of Merinphthah to Ethiopia. The 19th, according to the same authority, lasted to the establishment of a settled government under Rameses III., after the termination of the civil wars which the shepherds found or caused. Thus, if we divide the time from Amasis to Rameses III. into three parts, from Amasis to the extinction of his male descendants, from the extinction to the flight of Merinphthah, and from this flight to the accession of Rameses III., which Manetho fixed to 1195 b.c., immediately after his date of the taking of Troy, we shall have the 18th dynasty, as given by the Extractor, comprehending the two first of these three periods, making up 313 years; and the 19th dynasty, as given by him, comprehending the two last, making 127 years. What we have to seek for is therefore the length of any one of these three periods, which will give that of the other two, and we should then place the accession of Amasis, or the beginning of the 18th dynasty, and of the New Kingdom, so many years before 1322 b.c., as are contained in the first of the three periods.

Now it appears to me that the list of the 19th dynasty given by Africanus furnishes a means of valuing the two last periods. He

divides it into five reigns, to which he assigns 51, 61, 20, 60, 5, and 7 years, which he says make up 209 years. They really make up only 204, and it has been generally assumed that the second reign should be 66 in place of 61. This being assumed, we have the second and third reigns, $66 + 20 =$ the two last of the 18th dynasty, which, according to Josephus, are 66 2 + 19 6. I have already proved that Africanus added 82 years to this dynasty. The second and third are what they should be ; and the fifth and sixth have certainly not been increased. The additions of Africanus must therefore have been made to the first and third ; suppose 42 to the first, and 40 to the third. This would give for the six reigns $9 + 66 + 20 + 20 + 5 + 7 = 127$, which, on the principles laid down, divides itself into 95 and 32 ; and, of course, the 313 years will be divided into 218 and 95, and the accession of the 18th dynasty will be placed in B.N. 793 (12 Sept., 1540 B.C.) From this to the accession of the 25th dynasty was counted by Manetho 990 years $= 313 + 127 + 87 + 114 + 216 + 89 + 44$; but on account of three overlappings containing $95 + 2 + 78$ years $= 175$ years, the real chronological interval was only 815 years from B.N. 793 to A.N. 28.

There appears an objection to this view, in that it admits only three reigns in the 19th dynasty to the flight of Merinphthah, whereas there ought to be four. We might suppose that the first reign comprehended the two reigns of Rameses I. and Seti I. ; but there is another explanation of the matter, which I much prefer. It is however, so contrary to received opinions, that I deferred suggesting it till I had prepared the way for it by shewing its necessity. I believe that Manetho did not recognise Rameses I. as king of Egypt at all. I doubt if he was descended, even in the female line, from Amunhotep III., but I believe, that having married the daughter of Horus, he reigned in her right, claiming, however, to do so in his own. So it was with the kings of the 26th dynasty, and probably in other instances. That the reign of Seti I. lasted 9 years is probable, from the circumstance that Josephus gives him 59 years ; but $59 + 66 = 125$ for a father and son is out of the bounds of probability. The correction to 9 is the most natural that could be thought of. According to this view, the cycle was called after Rameses I., who instituted it ; but its first year was fixed at the commencement of the reign of Seti I., who came to the throne before the commencement of the year had moved a day from its original place. Cycles before this are, of course, only proleptic ones. Residing, as I do, a hundred miles from any public library, where copies of the inscriptions published by Lepsius and others are to be seen, I will make no attempt at dividing the 218

years which I assign to the kings of the 18th dynasty among the several reigns. I will only observe that the absolute date of the reign of Thotmes III., obtained from the inscription at Elephantine, which records the rising of the dog-star, will be found in perfect harmony with this chronology, and so will also the date of the inundation, as indicated by the Scarabaeus of Amunhotep III.

I have now travelled back from the list of Africanus, as handed down by the Syncellus, to the original list of the Extractor from Manetho; and from that to the genuine list of Manetho. The result of my criticism will, however, appear more clearly if I proceed in the reverse order. Accordingly, in the table which accompanies this, I give, in parallel columns, the chronology from the establishment of the New Kingdom of Cambyses in seven different forms; first, as Manetho gave the sums of the dynasties, with the overlapping dynasties marked, and with the first and last years of each dynasty noted; secondly, as Manetho was understood by his Extractor, who did not take into account the overlapping of the dynasties; thirdly, as the list stood when the Extractor had corrected (as he thought) Manetho's supposed mistakes; fourthly, as it stood when corrected by a Jew to reconcile it to what he thought the true Hebrew chronology; fifthly, as it stood when corrected by an early Christian to reconcile it with his date of the Exodus, and to do this in such a manner as would bring the commencement of the Olympiads to the first reign of the 23rd dynasty, where Manetho had stated that it should be placed; sixthly, as altered by Africanus to suit his raised date of the Exodus, and to do this so as to bring back the commencement of the 20th dynasty to its true date, as noted by Manetho; and, seventhly, as it was again altered by a corrector of Africanus, who brought back the accession of the 18th dynasty to its former place, but left the beginning of the two next as Africanus had placed them.

I have assumed that the Extractor from Manetho and the Jew are different; but I am inclined to suspect that the Extractor was a Jew, and that the two changes indicated in the third and fourth divisions were made by him simultaneously.

P.S.—On further examination of the lists of kings in the 18th dynasty, as given by the several authorities, I think it more probable that Seti I. reigned only five years, and Seti II. twenty-four. This would increase the length of the 18th dynasty by four years, throwing back its commencement to 1544 B.C. I have made this correction, which only affects the first line in the first division, and the column of years of the new kingdom, in the Table which follows.

* The three dynasties thus marked overlapped the following dynasties. The Extractor did not recognise this, and supposing that Manetho had made a false calculation, placing the accession of the 20th dynasty (which immediately followed the fall of Troy) 80 years too early, he struck these from the 22nd and dynasty; but in order to maintain the summation of 990, he added them to the 18th dynasty.

referred to those numbers in the lists after Manetho's own which are inconsistent with the three cardinal chronological data given by Manetho.